REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-19, 28, 35, 36, and 58-61 were pending. Claim 60 has been cancelled: Claims 17, 28, and 36 have been amended; and Claims 62-67 have been added by this amendment. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 17, 19, 35, and 58-61 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Takagi</u> in view of <u>Dixon</u>; Claim 28 and 36 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Takagi</u> and <u>Dixon</u> and further in view of <u>Hawkins</u>; Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Takagi</u> and <u>Dixon</u> and further in view of <u>Lee</u>.

Applicants will first discuss amended independent Claim 17. Support for the amendment to that clam may be found in previously presented Claim 19.

Turning now to the references cited in the rejection of Claim 17, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> does not disclose an LED that "has a plurality of light-emitting diodes matrix-arranged in a plan," as recited in amended independent Claim 17. In addition, although <u>Takagi</u> describes a configuration of a pivotable movement for the core of a hinge <u>axis</u>, there is no description as to a configuration of a rotation about <u>a direction perpendicular</u> to the core of a hinge axis as an axis. Clearly, therefore <u>Takagi</u> fails to disclose "said displayside casing is configured to be rotatable by at least 180° about a direction perpendicular to the core of a hinge axis as an axis."

<u>Dixon</u> shows in Fig. 3 six different stacks of dots. However, since each stack of dots has a different number of dots, is it respectfully submitted that these stacks of dots cannot be consider as a matrix arrangement. Further, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Dixon</u> does not describe at all that the casings are pivotable.

To sum up, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> and <u>Dixon</u> fail to disclose the configurations recited in amended independent Claim 17, that is, "an LED display panel matrix-arranged in a plane" and "said display-side casing is configured to be rotatable by at least 180° about a direction perpendicular to the core of a hinge axis as an axis." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these configurations would not have been obvious even from the combination of <u>Takagi</u> and <u>Dixon</u>.

Applicants will now discuss amended, newly independent Claim 28.

Turning now to the references cited in the rejection of Claim 28, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> does not disclose an LED that "has a plurality of light-emitting diodes matrix-arranged in a plane", as recited in amended newly independent Claim 28. In addition, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> does not describe an operation key operable in a state that casings are in their close position, either. Clearly, therefore <u>Takagi</u> fails to disclose "the main control unit switches display contents of the LED display panel by operation of said operation key."

<u>Dixon</u> shows in Fig. 3 six different stacks of dots. However, since each stack of dots has a different number of dots, is it respectfully submitted that the stacks of dots cannot be consider as a matrix arrangement. Further, since <u>Dixon</u> does not describe that the casings are pivotable, is it respectfully submitted that there is, as a matter of course, no description regarding an operation key operable in a state that casings are in their closed position.

To sum up, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> and <u>Dixon</u> fail to disclose the configurations recited in amended, newly independent Claim 28, that is, "an LED display panel matrix-arranged in a plane", "an operation key operable in a state that the operation-side casing and the display-side casing are in their closed position," and "the main control unit switches display contents of the LED display panel by operation of said operation key".

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these configurations would not have been obvious even

Application No. 10/574,970

Reply to Office Action of August 28, 2008

from the combination of Takagi and Dixon.

Applicants will now discuss amended, newly independent Claim 36.

Turning now to the references cited in the rejection of Claim 36, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> does not disclose an LED that "has a plurality of light-emitting diodes matrix-arranged in a plane", as recited in amended, newly independent Claim 36. In addition, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> does not describe an operation key operable in a state that casings are in their closed position, either. Clearly, therefore <u>Takagi</u> fails to disclose "display of said LED display panel turns on/off by operation of said operation key".

<u>Dixon</u> shows in Fig. 3 six different stacks of dots. However, since each stack of dots has the different number of dots, is it respectfully submitted that these stacks of dots cannot be considered as a matrix-arrangement. Further, since <u>Dixon</u> does not describe that the casings are pivotable, is it respectfully submitted that there is, as a matter of course, no description of an operation key operable in a state that casings ate in their closed position.

To sum up, is it respectfully submitted that <u>Takagi</u> and <u>Dixon</u> fail to disclose the configurations recited in amended, newly independent Claim 36, that is, "an LED display panel matrix-arranged in a plane", "an operation key operable in a state that the operation-side casing and the display-side casing are in their closed position" and "display of said LED display panel turns on/off by operation of said operation key". Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these configurations would not have been obvious even from the combination of Takagi and <u>Dixon</u>.

An early and favorable action on this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,

MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/07) Eckhard H. Kuesters Attorney of Record Registration No. 28,870

Charles L. Gholz Registration No. 26,395